

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that the Examiner has not even attempted to respond to any of the arguments from Amendment D, filed July 17, 2006, that traversed both the original Restriction Requirement of January 11, 2006, and the Examiner's determination to make the Requirement final on April 17, 2006. The Examiner still has not answered the substance of either traversal, and the outstanding Office Action fails to even acknowledge that the Restriction Requirement and its finality were again traversed on their merits in Amendment D. Accordingly, because these traversals remain entirely unchallenged on the record, the Restriction Requirement must be withdrawn, and full consideration given to claims 1-5 and 39 as well. The Examiner has provided no explanation for how the examination of only these 6 claims, out of the original 42 filed, would impose a serious burden upon him.

As a second preliminary matter, the drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner erroneously asserts that specific limitations that appear in claims 40 and 42 do not appear in the drawings. Applicants therefore traverse these objections as follows.

With respect to claim 40, the assertion that the last two paragraphs of claim 40 are not shown in the drawings is clearly erroneous. Specifically, the Examiner's assertion that the drawings do not show how the disconnection repairing contact holes "reach a surface of the transparent glass substrate on either opposing side of the disconnected wiring, and exposing at least an upper surface of the disconnected wiring" is clearly contradicted by the

drawings themselves, as well as Applicants' previous remarks. No consideration appears to have been given to these previous remarks.

For example, page 9 of Amendment C, filed November 14, 2005, expressly directs the Examiner's attention to several drawings and portions of the present Specification that provide full support to claims 40-42. With respect to claim 40, the Examiner was directed to at least Figs. 9, 15B, and 17A-D of the present Application, and accompanying text. Fig. 17B in particular shows all of the features from claim 40 that the Examiner now asserts to be missing from the drawings, namely, how a contact hole 217 is formed over a wiring 101 (disconnected at 201), and extending on either opposing side of the wiring 101 (arrow 205) to reach the surface of the glass substrate 121. Applicants are frankly at a loss to understand the objection. The drawings clearly show these features of claim 40, and these are the same pointed out to the Examiner previously. The objection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 42 of the present invention, the objection is similarly deficient. Applicants further informed the Examiner in Amendment C that "support for new claim 42 can be found at least at Fig. 16 and page 40, lines 5-25." This statement could not have been made any clearer. Fig. 16 of the present Application shows how the repairing contact holes 203, 205 are connected to each other "through the pixel electrode" 113. The text accompanying this drawing also describes how the contact holes can be connected either through the same pixel electrode (embodiment E), or through different pixel electrodes (embodiment F). The Examiner's citation to the phrase "one conductive film" is inappropriate, because the phrase does not appear anywhere in the language of claim 42.

As previously argued, and left entirely unchallenged on the record, the present Specification simply does not require that any particular conductive film must only be a single, continuous, and/or unitary structure, as erroneously asserted by the Examiner. It is well known in this field of art that a single film may be formed onto a structure in either a unitary or discontinuous form through the use of masks, laser CVD processing, or the like. The Examiner appears to have confused a simple labeling convenience from the drawings with the recitation of different elements in a claim. The two are not the same. The simple fact that two different numbers appear in a drawing does not necessarily mean that the element or elements so labeled are themselves so distinct. Plural examples, or portions, of the same element are often designated by different numbers in the drawings.

In the present Application, conducting films 209, 211 are simply never described to be necessarily formed from two separate conductive films, as the Examiner erroneously attempts to so limit the claims. One skilled in the art would easily understand, when reading the claims in light of the present Specification, how the two numbered films can be formed in either two separate processing steps, or together from the same single processing step. The present drawings clearly illustrate conductive films that are unitary in nature, but also conductive films that are formed of two or more separate and discrete portions. Nothing in the present Specification, and nothing in independent claim 40, limits the interpretation of the present invention to only one of these embodiments or the other. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is without merit, and should be withdrawn for any and all of the foregoing reasons.

Claims 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner has essentially repeated the objection to the drawings, as discussed above, but now as Section 112 written description rejections. The substance of this rejection, however, is the same as the objection. Applicants therefore traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed above, those reasons of record, and as follows.

As discussed above, all of the claim features for which the Examiner asserts to lack description are, in fact, clearly illustrated and described in the present Specification. Applicants have previously pointed the Examiner's attention to several portions of the Application that adequately illustrate and describe all of these features. The Examiner, however, has not commented on these particular drawings, but has instead confined his remarks only to several different drawings that Applicants did not discuss. Such selective consideration is entirely inappropriate. The Examiner is required to examine the entire Application as a whole, and not merely those portions (also taken out of context) that the Examiner believes to support his rejection.

The main rationale behind the Examiner's objection and rejection of the claims appears to be the erroneous assertion that a single element recited in a claim cannot be formed of separate and/or discrete portions. As explained above, there is simply no reasonable basis for such an assertion. For illustration purposes, the Examiner should see that Applicants could have easily just add two new dependent claims that respectively recited "the fourth conductive film is comprised of a single unitary structure," and "the fourth

conductive film is comprised of a plurality of separate and discrete portions.” Both of these claims could directly depend from the present claim 40, and both would be fully supported by the same independent claim.

It can be easily seen from this illustrative example how the outstanding objection and rejection are entirely inappropriate. Claim 40 is, in its present form as last amended, broad enough in scope to cover both illustrative embodiments. According to the present language of claim 40, the fourth conductive film may be either a single, continuous, and/or unitary structure, or it may be comprised of a plurality of separate and discrete portions. One skilled in the art is apprised that either embodiment can be achieved through application of the laser CVD method, for example. Applicants particularly note that, in every example the Examiner cites from the present Specification, the laser CVD method is consistently described as being able to form all of the conductive films at issue, whether single and unitary, or separate and discrete.

Furthermore, the Examiner is reminded that all of the present claims are method claims, and not apparatus claims. The particular limitation of “forming a fourth conductive film” recites a formation process that does not limit the final *structure* of the film that is formed according to such a process, as the Examiner repeatedly attempts to require of the claims. The Examiner has not, for example, cited to one portion of the Specification requiring that any of the cited films be formed by a different method, or in a different step, from the other films. The claimed method step therefore, is entirely supported by the Specification and the drawings.

The Examiner is further reminded that the Federal Circuit has often held that reciting "a" particular element in a claim is equivalent to reciting "one or more" of that particular element. Unless the claim itself requires "only" one of such an element, the interpretation of the claim may not be limited by the Examiner to require such a restrictive interpretation. The Examiner must either provide some objective authority on the record that supports his overly restrictive interpretation, or withdraw all of the outstanding objections and rejections.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-5 and 39-42, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if a further interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Josh C. Snider

Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

January 29, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\1508165377\B56175.DOC